

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
SR-520 TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES
UW CENTER FOR URBAN HORTICULTURE, SEATTLE, WA
JUNE 27, 2002 – 9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

INTRODUCTION, WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, opened the meeting and introduced members of the project team including: Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT; Les Rubstello, WSDOT; Jeff Peacock, Parametrix; and Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill. The objective of the meeting was to provide a summary of the June 12th Executive Committee meeting, review summary-level project alternative information, and obtain feedback on the definition for accommodating high-capacity transit (HCT) as well as selection of a preliminary preferred alternative. The group agreed to postpone discussion of indirect and cumulative impacts until the next meeting to best utilize the time as a joint committee.

Les Rubstello related the outcome of the June 12th Executive Committee meeting. The Committee concurred with the interchange definitions as developed in consultation with local jurisdictions, and concurred with the proposed transportation demand management (TDM) program. Items remaining for Executive Committee action include accommodating high-capacity transit on SR-520, lid definition, and consideration of managed lanes and pricing. The Executive Committee also decided to select a preliminary preferred project alternative (PPA) at its July 9 meeting, in response to pending decisions on projects to be included in a fall ballot for regional transportation funding.

The following general points were raised:

- Jean Amick, Laurelhurst neighborhood, asked whether progress had been made on the letter that was written to the Coast Guard regarding operation of the Montlake Bridge. Les Rubstello responded that the project has not heard from the Coast Guard. Les will follow up with Austin Pratt of the Coast Guard.
- Jonathan Dubman, Montlake Community Club, questioned whether the Executive Committee needed to make a PPA decision before writing the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). Les responded that the Executive Committee asked for a summary of all of the information relevant to making the decision. That information was provided in the handout and presentation, all committees thus

have the same information on which to base decisions. The regional vote is still scheduled to take place November of 2002, driving the Executive Committee's decision. If this changes, the committees will be informed of a delay in the PPA process.

- Terry Marpert, City of Redmond, wanted clarification of the reasons for having a PPA decided at the time of the regional vote. Terry also wanted to know what the cost would be in the first phase of project implementation. Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO, confirmed that risk of bridge failure and the need to replace the bridge are the motivating factors in going to the voters as soon as possible. She reminded the group that, above all else, we must meet the vision of the corridor. Maureen continued that everyone has seen the cost range estimates, and there is not much more information out there on cost, phase-specific or otherwise. She stressed that it is an urgent concern, and needs to be taken care of immediately.
- Paul Demitriades, City of Medina, expressed concern over making a PPA decision on July 9. He wanted to know whether the Executive Committee was being asked to make a decision on Phase I, Phase II or on both phases. Maureen said that it isn't WSDOT's choice to do the project in phases; it would be ideal to do it at all at once. If phasing is necessary, it will be wise to have the building blocks prepared. The decision being reached on July 9 is not necessarily phase-related.
- Ethan Melone, City of Seattle, acknowledged that there is tremendous risk involved with identifying a PPA and then possibly not getting final approval. Ethan stressed that it is not just important for voters to understand the cost, but the project has to identify a cost estimate. He also wanted to make sure that the Executive Committee knows what it is voting on with regard to phasing. Maureen responded that the project is now legally required to be within 20% of cost estimates. The project needs to have established goals, if it wants to stay within that range. Les added that when WSDOT completes an EIS, they identify a preferred alternative; identifying a PPA is not required. It is helpful, however, to have a preliminary preferred alternative when writing the EIS.
- Ann Martin, King County Transportation, questioned the impacts on transportation and the environment with phasing. She suggested they be evaluated. In order to make a decision on phasing, agencies will need to understand how phasing would operate and what the impacts would be. Les reiterated that the project team was not planning on deciding whether or not to do phasing on July 9. Once the PPA is picked, if the question of phasing comes up, then the project team will develop needed information about risks and impacts.
- Eugene Wasserman, Neighborhood Business Council, indicated that the project will undoubtedly be phased and it is a waste of public dollars to try and ignore

that fact. He wanted to know why an EIS isn't going to be written for the first phase in and of itself. Les responded by saying that WSDOT is not sure how much of the project will be built from regional money, so they do not know how much phasing would cost; phasing is dependent on many things. Regarding the EIS concern, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) owns the process and they insist that a corridor-wide EIS be completed, even if the project is phased, because they want to know the overall impacts. Jonathan Dubman, agreed with FHWA's interpretation and doesn't think it is a waste of money, it is the purpose of NEPA to do that.

REVIEW OF SUMMARY-LEVEL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES INFORMATION

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, provided summary information on the project alternatives, all information provided to the committees over the past year. He summarized the performance and effectiveness of the three alternatives and the costs associated with each alternative. Lorie Parker briefed the group regarding the distinguishing environmental impacts of each alternative and Barb Gilliland presented information relevant to accommodating HCT in the SR-520 corridor. Presentation materials are attached

4-LANE ALTERNATIVE

Jeff recapped the 4-lane alternative, primarily built to increase the corridor's reliability and safety by adding shoulders and a bicycle and pedestrian path. He reminded the committees that they should remember that the 4-lane alternative's improvements would only extend to Bellevue Way.

The following were questions and concerns regarding the 4-lane alternative:

- Doug Schulze, City of Medina, was concerned that the flyer stop on 92nd Ave NE was not represented on the slide. Jeff said that it was an oversight, there is a flyer stop planned at 92nd Ave NE.
- Virginia Gunby, 1000 Friends of Washington, asked if the design would straighten the curves and inquired about how much additional capacity this alternative would carry. She queried whether the option would be in place to increase speed. Jeff responded that the lane widening would be minimal and that the existing 2-foot shoulders would become 10 feet wide. The difference in capacity would be minimal, generally this option would be used to improve safety and reliability. He said while traffic might pick up with the additional space, speed was not a consideration in designing this alternative.
- Jean Amick asked whether there would be a high-rise on the west side, she thought that it had been taken out of the design plans. Jeff said that there would be a westside high-rise to address stormwater concerns. Mike Grady, National

Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), told the group that no agreement has yet been reached on what to do with the stormwater issue.

- Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, commented since there are so few boats using that area of the lake, it would make an excellent case for not needing a high-rise. He asked if Congress had been approached about a waiver to statutory height requirements. Jeff responded that the 70-foot high-rise on the eastside was needed not only for navigation but also to gain elevation back onto the shore.
- There was a question whether the gradient of the high-rise would preclude some HCT technology. Jeff answered that building a high-rise would still allow for HCT if future decision makers chose to add that feature.

6-LANE ALTERNATIVE

Jeff summarized the features of the 6-lane alternative. He reminded the committees that this alternative would involve the addition of an HOV lane, BRT in the center and a 4-foot buffer between the HOV lane and the general purpose lane. There would be significant changes to the Montlake interchange as well (“braided ramps” to allow HOV access to the University).

The following were questions and concerns regarding the 6-lane alternative:

- Peter Dewey, University of Washington, asked if the additional crossing of the Montlake Cut (part of the 8-lane alternative) would fit with the 6-lane braided ramps. Jeff responded that it would and that the project team is making improvements to the design.

8-LANE ALTERNATIVE

Jeff described the 8-lane alternative and said that the only thing that has changed is that direct access to Redmond Town Center is not currently in this alternative. He said that further clarification is necessary on exactly how HOV lanes would terminate at Union Hill Road.

The following were questions and concerns regarding the 8-lane alternative:

- Virginia Gunby asked if Bear Creek would be moved in this alternative. Jeff replied that they are still working on how to deal with Bear Creek and Les reminded the group that the 6- and 8-lane alternatives have the same footprint.
- Jim MacIssac, Eastside Transportation Commission, asked if they have clearance to go through to the Redmond Town Center area. Jeff responded that there is no longer the need to go there, that past diagrams are now invalid.

- Doug Schulze asked for a graphic showing interior flyer stops before the July 9 Executive Committee meeting. Jeff replied flyer stops would be in the center and that there would be one at Evergreen Point and one at 92nd for both 6- and 8-lanes.
- Paul Demitriades, City of Medina, asked the project team to brief the Water Resource Inventory Area (WIRA) planning unit on the project.

SR-520 PERFORMANCE TABLE

Jeff summarized projected 2020 performance on SR-520, including the daily person throughput, daily vehicle throughput, reliability (including general purpose and transit), and travel time during peak hours. There is a substantive TDM plan in each alternative, but it is used differently depending on which option is chosen. These were key criteria the project team felt needed to be addressed before any decisions could be made.

The following questions and points were provided:

- Eugene Wasserman asked if they had considered additional trips and new trips. He wanted to know specifically how many trips were moved from I-90 to SR-520.
- Virginia Gunby inquired as to toll analysis and whether they knew what impact tolls would have on the bridge. Jeff replied that they are analyzing tolls and how the regional system would work. Virginia asked when that would be done and Maureen responded that that would be ready in July.
- Jonathan Dubman said that he was interested in hearing about the no-action alternative. Jeff told the group that the 4-lane alternative is essentially a no-action alternative.
- Eugene Wasserman questioned the substantial decrease in HOV users. Why, when HOV transit ridership goes up, travel time goes up as well? Jeff agreed that it seems counterintuitive. He explained that with widening the bridge, they would actually create more trips across the bridge. If more people use the bridge, including more people using transit to cross the bridge, travel time actually does go up. Eugene Wasserman asked if the team would analyze increased economic activity based on this principle. He said that it would be interesting to see what kind of economic impact each alternative would have.
- Jim MacIssac, Eastside Transportation Association, expressed concern regarding the difference between the numbers presented at this meeting and the last time the committee met. He wanted to know why there is such a decrease in transit trips since information was presented last year. The team committed to follow up with Jim to understand the differences.

- Krista Rave-Perkins, EPA, indicated a problem understanding the 8-lane travel time. Previous materials indicated that travel time went up, now it appears to go down. She also had concerns regarding the bottleneck getting onto I-5 from SR-520; she feels that the travel time projection is far too low. Jeff told the group that the travel times listed on the slide were to I-5 only and did not include I-5 as part of the trip time. In response to the bottleneck issues, he told the committees that with both weaves eliminated, flow on I-5 would actually improve.
- Mark Weed, Fisher Properties, asked the group to look at the numbers from an economic and user standpoint. He said that while residents are sitting in traffic, they could be producing. He asked the group to think about what they would earn in dollars if they got back a half an hour or more a day, if they weren't sitting traffic. He called this "windshield time" and asked about the economic impacts of reducing it.

LOCAL ARTERIAL CHANGES NEEDED TO SUPPORT PROJECTED VOLUMES

Jeff presented a 2020 table showing eastside and westside arterial improvements that would need to occur in both the 6- and 8-lane alternatives to keep arterials functioning as they would under a no-action alternative. The project team had looked at 88 intersections; a total of 160 intersections will be analyzed.

Questions and concerns regarding this information:

- Peter Beaulieu, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), pointed out that since the rest of the system is held to a no-action level, this may overstate the need/benefit of particular corridor volumes, especially in regard to arterial impacts. Jeff indicated that improvements in several other corridors are being modeled interactively in the form of sensitivity tests.
- Virginia Gunby asked who would be responsible when changes need to be made and how could the public be certain the changes would actually take place. Jeff said that it would become part of the project definition.
- Bernard Van de Kamp, City of Bellevue, asked if the arterial improvements are driven by economic factors. He wanted to know how they determine the thresholds driving improvements?

DISTINGUISHING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (IN 4-, 6-, AND 8-LANE ALTERNATIVES)

Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, reviewed a subset of distinguishing environmental impacts of each alternative. With the definition of interchanges, many things have changed since the committees last met. Originally, they had done worst-case scenarios and now the

analysis shows that impacts are less than first reported. The handout shows the relative differences between the alternatives. Wetland impacts are conservative on the meeting handout, since it assumes the road lies directly on the wetland. In the EIS, they will be able to figure out what piers are physically standing in the wetlands and where the actual footprint is. Parks and trails are relatively similar between the alternatives. Displacements, most of which are around the I-405 interchange, have come down since the last analysis. The land required for the 6- and 8-lane alternatives are far more substantial than for the 4-lane alternative.

During the environmental impacts discussion, the following input was provided:

- Mike Grady wanted to know whether the right-of-way land acquisition includes wetland and additional stormwater. Lorie replied that it does not.
- Eugene Wasserman commented that the 6-lane (when compared to the 4-lane) alternative is bad all around, specifically in that environmental impacts are large, but the throughput problem is not alleviated proportionately.
- Paul Demitriades stated that the amount of wetlands impacted and the numbers for displacement are understated. He wanted to see numbers of streams and creeks impacted in addition to parks. He also felt that we should acknowledge that there are other indirect impacts, such as decreasing real estate values. Lorie responded to his concern by telling the group that they will do relocation analysis later, this table is just for houses and other structures that will get physically removed.
- Krista Rave-Perkins clarified that the table presented to the group did not include streams, only wetlands, and asked whether it included side roads and if the streams would need culverts. Lorie answered that they didn't have that information yet.
- Bernard Van de Kamp reminded the group that this was always considered to be the worst-case scenario. Now that the figures have been refined, he wondered if this was still meant to be taken as a worst-case scenario. Lorie said this was basically the quick and dirty analysis and not necessarily meant to be considered best or worst. She said that it is simply the most up-to-date information that was available. Les added that from WSDOT's point of view it is still worst-case since the numbers will only get smaller (in other words, better), but agreed with Lorie that it shouldn't be taken as best or worst by everyone.
- Doug Schulze wanted to know if there was a difference in the Eastside alignment between 4- and 6-lane alternatives. Jeff replied that it would land 200 feet north of the existing bridge regardless.

- Mike Grady asked if Sammamish River weren't available as a discharge body for stormwater, would the right-of-way numbers increase. Lorie responded that they would have to have a large detention pond, which was not included in this analysis.

PROJECT COST RANGES

Jeff Peacock presented the next series of slides that described each alternative, estimated its schedule, and gave the range of project costs for each alternative.

4-LANE ALTERNATIVE

The following were questions and concerns addressed during the 4-lane cost range discussion:

- Paul Demitriades asked what percentage of the design had been completed. When Jeff replied that it was very subjective, but that a good estimate would be about 5% completed, he indicated that it is impossible to have 90% confidence with only 5% of the design process completed.
- Virginia Gunby asked if the pontoons would be widened and would the widening be done during the first phase or would it be added on sometime later. Jeff answered that it would be a part of the project as a whole.

6-LANE ALTERNATIVE

The following were questions and concerns addressed during the 6-lane cost range discussion:

- Virginia Gunby wanted to know if they have TDM in 4-, 6-, and 8-lane estimates. Jeff said yes.

8-LANE ALTERNATIVE

The following were questions and concerns addressed during the 8-lane cost range discussion:

- Peter Beaulieu asked if this included the full cost of the SR-520 – I-405 interchange. Les replied that it did.
- Bernard Van de Kamp asked if the cost included structures other than pontoons, and would it accommodate HCT for that price.
- Krista Rave-Perkins asked what the breakdown on mitigation was and if mitigation costs were captured in that cost estimate. Jeff replied that it included

lids, noise walls, and some other items and that yes, the cost for the mitigation and enhancement was included in the estimated price.

HCT ACCOMMODATION IN THE SR-520

Barb Gilliland, Sound Transit, reminded the committees that the Executive Committee had requested the team examine the option of accommodating HCT in the SR-520 corridor in the future. There are several options for defining that accommodation. Barb told the group that HCT in the SR-520 corridor is a 50-75 year option, which is significantly longer than the 20-year scope for the SR-520 project. However, the committees can still choose whether or not to plan for future HCT in the corridor. She described options in two corridor segments.

MONTLAKE TO 124TH AVE NE

The first segment, from Montlake to 124th Ave NE, looks at four scenarios for HCT in the future.

1. The “No Accommodation” scenario would not add any costs or additional right of way to existing plans and would not have any design impacts or alignment commitments. However, by not planning for HCT, it makes it more difficult should the need arise to plan for it later. Also, this option would have the highest total project cost in the long term and have potentially high future environmental impacts.
2. The “Accommodate on Floating Bridge Only” scenario adds cost to the floating bridge and approach spans only and requires minimal right of way additions with no additional displacements. This would provide high flexibility for HCT alignment on either side of the lake and has the smallest investment risk if HCT is never implemented. However, future use for HCT could be costly and disruptive beyond the floating bridge, with higher cost and environmental impacts. EIS analysis of a future HCT line may be required now if it increases right of way and/or environmental impacts when compared to “no accommodation.”
3. The “Accommodate on Lake Crossing and Key Structures (e.g. lids, underpasses, interchanges, etc)” option would reduce the overall costs and impacts of both projects combined, while also being less complex and disruptive, since key structures remain in place. However, there is moderate to high cost to the Trans-Lake project with very uncertain HCT timing and funding and some of the added right of way may even prove to be unnecessary if HCT is not implemented. This option makes it difficult to change the alignment of HCT in the future and would probably force the Trans-Lake project to develop an EIS now if it increases right of way and/or environmental impacts when compared to “no accommodation”.
4. The “Preserve HCT on the Full Corridor” option would actually plan on HCT being built now as part of the highway design. This offers the lowest cost for implementing future HCT and has the potential for the lowest overall cost and

environmental impacts of both projects combined, while allowing for optimal HCT alignment to be fully integrated with highway design and construction. However, this option has the highest cost impacts for the Trans-Lake project with uncertain HCT timing and funding and requires further design development now of both highway and HCT alignments. It is the least flexible for HCT alignment changes and has the highest risk of unnecessary property acquisition or construction. This option would also require an EIS now since it will increase right of way and environmental impacts when compared to “no accommodation”.

The following questions and concerns were raised at this time:

- Ethan Melone stated that the Executive Committee needs to see costs presented in both expected and present value. Seattle officials would like to accommodate HCT, but not without further cost/wetland information. Barb responded that qualitatively we can do it. She agreed to describe future costs more thoroughly.
- Ann Martin, King County Department of Transportation, noted that they could accommodate HCT on the westside without taking any right of way. She wanted to know if the conclusion is that the project team wouldn't have to physically do much to accommodate HCT overall and she also wanted to know how the decision of whether or not to accommodate HCT was to be made.
- Mike Grady had a question regarding environmental impacts. He felt that Scenarios 3 and 4 were the best options even though he thought that more analysis was necessary. He reasoned that if it is likely that HCT will happen, it would be better to do it now while the land can be obtained. He felt that Scenarios 3 and 4 would allow a comprehensive analysis of the project to better mitigate impacts.
- Jonathan Dubman feels that the issue is to have enough information to come up with a PPA to accommodate HCT. The pressure to come up with a PPA is dissipating, but it is still important for the Executive Committee to know that these committees are not comfortable with this. He felt that they should advise the Executive Committee that they not go along with a PPA until the vote comes through in the fall. The vote would also indicate whether the Monorail and Sound Transit are options.
- Bernard Van de Kamp felt that if HCT is too far in the future, preserving HCT throughout the corridor is premature. He stated that the SR-520 crossing has always been conceptual, and since I-90 was supposed to get HCT first and it hasn't happened yet, buying up right of way for SR-520 would be a mistake.
- Ann Martin asked what the lifespan of a new bridge would be. Barb replied that it would be 50-75 years.

- Mike Grady asked if there is really a need for 6 lanes if there are a large number of commuters using the transit system.

124 AVE NE TO REDMOND

The 3 scenarios from 124th Ave NE to Redmond are:

1. The “No Accommodation” scenario is basically the same for the second segment.
2. The “Accommodation at Key Structures” option is slightly different. In this scenario, HCT implementation would be less complex and disruptive since under-crossing north of Overlake will be in place and would require no additional right of way or displacements as part of the Trans-Lake project. However, this option requires an early investment in under-crossing of SR-520 north of Overlake as part of the Trans-Lake project and requires further design development now of HCT alignment at the under-crossing. There are also potential risks of unnecessary under-crossing construction if HCT alignment changes.
3. In the “Preservation on the Full Corridor” scenario, the integrated design over the length of the corridor reduces overall costs and impacts of both projects combined while also making HCT line implementation far easier than with the “No Accommodation” option. However, there is a very high cost impact for the Trans-Lake project due to additional right of way acquisition and is the least flexible for future HCT alignment changes. This option requires significant design development now throughout the corridor to refine HCT envelope requirements and an EIS analysis would likely be required now.

The following questions and concerns were raised at this time:

- Roland White, Kirkland Transportation Commission, asked whether it is a necessity to go underneath SR-520 or if it was a possibility to go overhead. Barb said she wasn’t sure since that was an engineering decision, Jeff added that based on the data, underneath seemed to be a better option.
- Jonathan Dubman noted that Scenario 3 has an especially high cost and asked if it proved to be unnecessary, if the right of way could be sold to recoup expenses. Barb said that they would purchase only those pieces that would be necessary which might have no value later. Jeff added that there is a high likelihood of a legal challenge. If it isn’t needed absolutely and is done anyway, issues of trust between the project and the community are raised.
- Len Newstrum noted that there are other ways out of Redmond and stated that he supports Scenario 2.

COMMITTEE INPUT FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Members provided input on their preferences related to a preliminary preferred alternative and definition of accommodating HCT. Results are attached to this summary.

The following questions and concerns were raised at this time:

- Jonathan Freedman, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, expressed concern that the request of committee members to state their preference for a PPA is premature and more information is needed before making this decision. He also stated that the purpose of NEPA is to incorporate environmental concerns into agency decision-making. Jonathan feels that selection of a PPA at this stage would take attention away from focusing on the performance and impacts of all alternatives.

NEXT STEPS

The Executive Committee will meet on September 5 at the Museum of History and Industry, Seattle, WA. This meeting will primarily focus on identifying a preliminary preferred alternative, including definition of high capacity transit accommodation along the SR-520 corridor. The project team will provide information for the Executive Committee that will ultimately lead to a decision on a preliminary preferred alternative. Technical and Advisory Committee inputs will be shared with the Executive Committee.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PowerPoint presentation

ACTION ITEMS

- Find out if any progress has been made on the letter that was written to the Coast Guard.
- Create a graphic that includes interior flyer stops for the Points' Communities.
- Brief WRIA on project.
- Find out how many trips would be moved from I-90 to SR-520.
- Find out how many streams would be impacted, whether side roads are included in environmental impact estimate, and whether impacted streams will need culverts.
- Make a distinction between expected and present value with regard to HCT accommodation investments.

MEETING ATTENDEES

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Present	Name		ORGANIZATION
	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
X	Beaulieu	Peter	PSRC
	Brooks	Allyson	Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
X	Buchanan	Kurt	Department of Fish and Wildlife
	Carr	Paul	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Cushman	King	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Drais	Dan	FTA
X	Dewey	Peter	University of Washington
X	Freedman	Jonathan	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
X	Godfrey	Dave	City of Kirkland
X	Grady	Mike	National Marine Fisheries Service
X	Kennedy	Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	Kennedy	Steve	Sound Transit
	Kennedy Smith	Helena	WSDOT
	Kenny	Ann	Washington Department of Ecology
	Kircher	Dave	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (Paul Carr)
	Leonard	Jim	Federal Highway Administration
X	Marpert	Terry	City of Redmond
X	Martin	Ann	King County Department of Transportation
X	Melone	Ethan	City of Seattle
	Nelson	Kitty	National Marine Fisheries Service
X	Newstrum	Len	Town of Yarrow Point
	Pratt	Austin	U.S. Coast Guard, 13 th District
	Pratt	Cynthia	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
	Quan	Jennifer	US Fish and Wildlife Service
X	Rave-Perkins	Krista	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
	Sanchez	Susan	City of Seattle
X	Schulze	Doug	City of Medina
	Sparrman	Goran	City of Bellevue
	Suggs	Sarah	WA Department of Ecology
X	Sullivan	Maureen	WSDOT – UCO
	Swanson	Terry	Washington Department of Ecology
	Teachout	Emily	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
X	Van de Kamp	Bernard	City of Bellevue
X	Wasserman	Mitch	City of Clyde Hill
	Willis	Joe	Town of Hunts Point

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Present	Name		Organization
X	Amick	Jean	Laurelhurst Community Club
X	Andrews	Deborah	Arboretum Foundation
	Aschenbach	Hans	Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance
	Becklund	Kim	City of Bellevue
	Culp	Barbara	Bicycle Alliance of Washington
X	Demitriades	Paul	City of Medina
X	Dent	Bob	Town of Hunts Point
X	Dubman	Jonathan	Montlake Community Council
X	Eades	Bertha	City of Redmond
X	Gunby	Virginia	1000 Friends of Washington
	Hallenbeck	Mark	UW TRAC
X	Hart	Fred	Greater University Chamber of Commerce
	Hill	Jim	Microsoft Corporation
	Hill	Gregory	Streeter Architects
	Holman	Linda	Van Waters & Rogers
	Hurley	Peter	Transportation Choices Coalition
	Joneson	Kingsley	Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
X	MacIsaac	Jim	Eastside Transportation Commission
	McKinley	Kirk	Pedestrian Advocate
	Newstrum	Elizabeth	Town of Yarrow Point
	Odell	Nina	Puget Sound Energy
	Ray	Janet	AAA Washington
	Reckers, Jr.	James	Eastlake Community Council
X	Resha	John	Greater Redmond Transportation Management Association
	Sheck	Ronald	Transit Solutions
	Tate	Bob	Clyde Hill
	Tochterman	Thomas B.	Tochterman Management Group
X	Wasserman	Eugene	Neighborhood Business Council
X	Weed	Mark	Fisher Properties, Inc.
	White	Rich	Boeing
X	White	Roland	Kirkland Transportation Commission
	Wyble	John	Moxie Media

Project Team

Les Rubstello, WSDOT
 Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
 Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
 Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
 Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
 Joy Goldenberg, EnviroIssues
 Courtney Harris, EnviroIssues

CRH

Technical/Advisory Committee HCT & PPA Selection Matrix

Committee Member	<u>HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT</u>		<u>Preliminary Preferred Alternative</u>	
	Montlake to 124th Ave. NE	124th Ave. NE to Redmond	Selection	Comments
Amick, Jean	No rec.	No rec.	4 or 6	
Andrews, Deborah	No rec.	No rec.	No rec.	D
Beaulieu, Peter	2	1	6	C
Buchanan, Kurt	No rec.	No rec.	No rec.	F
Demitriades, Paul	1	1	No rec.	D
Dent, Bob	4	4	8	
Dewey, Peter	1	1	6	B
Dubman, Jonathon	No rec.	No rec.	4	E
Eades, Bertha	4	4	6	C
Freedman, Jonathon	2	3	No rec.	D, F
Godfrey, Dave	3	2	6	
Grady, Mike	4	4	6	F
Gunby, Virginia	No rec.	No rec.	4	D, E
Hart, Fred	2	1	No rec.	D
Kennedy, Jack	No rec.	No rec.	No rec.	F
MacIsaac, Jim	1	1	8	
Marpert, Terry	4	2 or 3	6	A
Martin, Ann	2	3	6	E
Melone, Ethan	1	1	6	D
Newstrum, Len	3	2	6	E
Rave, Krista	No rec.	No rec.	No rec.	A, D, F
Schulze, Doug	1	1	No rec.	A, B, E
Van de Kamp, Bernard	2	1	8	D
Wasserman, Mitch	1	1	6 or 8	D
White, Roland	2	1	6	

KEY: HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT

1. No accommodation
2. Accommodate on floating bridge only
3. Accommodate on lake crossing and key structures
4. Preserve on full corridor

KEY: PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE COMMENTS

- A. Lessen environmental impacts
- B. Include pricing on one or both corridors
- C. Increase BRT/HOV lanes
- D. Sites lack of information
- E. Include managed lanes
- F. Resource Agency – in appropriate to recommend